

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JEFFREY L. DRYDEN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JANITA FAEN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01625-GMN-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 66)

On March 1, 2017, when the parties had failed to timely file a joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order, the Court ordered them to file, no later than March 7, 2017, a joint proposed discovery plan or a status report explaining why a discovery plan should not be filed at this time. Docket No. 65. On March 7, 2017, Defendants filed a status report, wherein Defendants ask the Court to stay discovery pending the resolution of Defendants' motion to dismiss at Docket No. 59. *See* Docket No. 66 at 3 ("Defendants respectfully request that the Court refrain from entering a discovery plan pending the outcome of Defendants' Renewed Motion to Dismiss"). "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). Moreover, Defendants provide no authority to support a stay of discovery, and the request is procedurally improper. *See* Docket No. 66.

1 If Defendants want to request a stay of discovery, they must do so by filing a motion on the  
2 docket that includes appropriate authority. Any such motion must be filed no later than March 15,  
3 2017. If Defendants fail to file a motion to stay discovery by March 15, 2017, the parties must file  
4 a joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order no later than March 17, 2017. The filing of a  
5 motion to stay discovery by March 15, 2017, will stay discovery pending the Court's resolution of  
6 that motion.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: March 8, 2017

9  
10   
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28